

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 * * *

6 D. WILLIAMS,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA, *et al.*,

10 Defendants.

Case No. 3:21-cv-00217-MMD-CLB

ORDER

11
12 *Pro se* Plaintiff D. Williams brings this civil action against Defendants, the United
13 States District Court for the District of Nevada, the United States, the State of Nevada,
14 and “Corporations I-C and Does I-C”. (ECF No. 1-1.) Before the Court is the Report and
15 Recommendation (“R&R” or “Recommendation”) of United States Magistrate Judge Carla
16 L. Baldwin (ECF No. 3), recommending that Williams’s application to proceed *in forma*
17 *pauperis* be granted and that Williams’s complaint be dismissed with prejudice. Williams
18 had until May 31, 2021, to file an objection. To date, no objection to the R&R has been
19 filed. For this reason, and as explained below, the Court adopts the R&R, and will dismiss
20 this action with prejudice.

21 The Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or
22 recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party
23 fails to object to a magistrate judge’s recommendation, the Court is not required to
24 conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas*
25 *v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114,
26 1116 (9th Cir. 2003) (“De novo review of the magistrate judges’ findings and
27 recommendations is required if, but *only* if, one or both parties file objections to the
28 findings and recommendations.”) (emphasis in original); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, Advisory

1 Committee Notes (1983) (providing that the Court “need only satisfy itself that there is no
2 clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”).

3 Because there is no objection, the Court need not conduct *de novo* review, and is
4 satisfied Judge Baldwin did not clearly err. Here, Judge Baldwin recommends dismissing
5 this action as Williams’s complaint is rambling, nonsensical, and filled with incomplete
6 sentences. (ECF No. 3 at 3.) Moreover, Williams does not state a claim upon which relief
7 may be granted and amendment would be futile. (*Id.* at 4.) The Court agrees with Judge
8 Baldwin. Having reviewed the R&R and the record in this case, the Court will adopt the
9 R&R in full.

10 It is therefore ordered that Judge Baldwin’s Report and Recommendation (ECF
11 No. 3) is accepted and adopted in full.

12 It is further ordered that Plaintiff D. Williams’s application to proceed *in forma*
13 *pauperis* (ECF No. 1) is granted.

14 The Clerk of Court is directed to file Williams’s complaint (ECF No. 1-1).

15 It is further ordered that Williams’s complaint (ECF No. 1-1) is dismissed with
16 prejudice.

17 The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this case.

18 DATED THIS 1st Day of July 2021.

19
20
21 
22 MIRANDA M. DU
23 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
24
25
26
27
28